arXiv:0901.4933v1 [math.RA] 30 Jan 2009

THE ALGEBRA OF FILTERS OF A CUBIC ALGEBRA

COLIN G. BAILEY AND JOSEPH S. OLIVEIRA

Abstract. In this paper we discuss the inclusion ordering on the filters of a filter algebra, a special type of Metropolis-Rota algeba. Using embeddings into interval algebras we show that the notion of "untwisted" gives rise to a congruence relation on the group of g-filters. We also show that there is a natural reflection operator on the class of filters with an easily definable enveloping cubic subalgebra.

1. Introduction

One of the many variants on the Stone representation theorem for Boolean algebras shows that the poset of filters for a Boolean algebra is isomorphic to the poset of closed sets of its Stone space. This is another way to get a representation of Boolean algebras.

In this paper we consider a similar idea as applied to cubic and MR-algebras, in particular the subclass of filter algebras. We look at the class of all filters on a filter algebra $\mathcal{L}$ which is naturally ordered by inclusion.

On this class we can define the relation "relatively untwisted" which simply says two filters sit the same way in a representation of $\mathcal{L}$ as a subalgebra of an interval algebra. We will show that this relation is a congruence relation on the group of g-filters of $\mathcal{L}$.

As an extension of the ideas used in that proof we will show that there is a binary operation Δ definable on the class of all filters. Under reverse inclusion this class is almost cubic – the failure is because we are actually working in a Heyting algebra.

By defining two notions of Boolean elements we can construct an interval algebra from this class into which $\mathcal{L}$ embeds as a full subalgebra. The strongest notion of Boolean-ness gives rise to a cubic algebra in which the vertices are exactly the g-filters of $\mathcal{L}$ and the inner automorphisms are exactly the filter automorphisms of $\mathcal{L}$.

Before we begin in earnest we recall some of the basic definitions and results of cubic algebra.

Definition 1.1. *A* cubic algebra *is a join semi-lattice with one and a binary operation* Δ *satisfying the following axioms:*

a. *if* $x \leq y$ *then* $\Delta(y, x) \vee x = y$*;*
b. *if* $x \leq y \leq z$ *then* $\Delta(z, \Delta(y, x)) = \Delta(\Delta(z, y), \Delta(z, x))$*;*
c. *if* $x \leq y$ *then* $\Delta(y, \Delta(y, x)) = x$*;*
d. *if* $x \leq y \leq z$ *then* $\Delta(z, x) \leq \Delta(z, y)$*;*
Let $xy = \Delta(1, \Delta(x \vee y, y)) \vee y$ *for any* x*,* y *in* $\mathcal{L}$*. Then:*
e. $(xy)y = x \vee y$*;*
f. $x(yz) = y(xz)$*;*

Date: February 1, 2009.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06A06, 06E99.
Key words and phrases. Boolean algebras, Implication algebras, Cubes, Congruences, Filters.

Definition 1.2. *An* MR-algebra *is a cubic algebra satisfying the MR-axiom: if $a, b < x$ then*

$$\Delta(x, a) \vee b < x \textit{ iff } a \wedge b \textit{ does not exist.}$$

One way to think about cubic algebras is as a family of connected implication algebras "joined" by the symmmetry group generated by Δ. The relation $\preccurlyeq$ is one way we use to describe the way different implication algebras in this collection are related to one another. In some sense it is the spread out version of the partial order.

Definition 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra and $a, b \in \mathcal{L}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} a \preceq b &\textit{ iff } \Delta(a \vee b, a) \leq b \\ a \simeq b &\textit{ iff } \Delta(a \vee b, a) = b. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1.4. *Let $\mathcal{L}$, a, b be as in the definition. Then*

$$a \preceq b \textit{ iff } b = (b \vee a) \wedge (b \vee \Delta(1, a)).$$

Proof. See [3] lemmas 2.7 and 2.12. □

Proposition 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra, and p, q in $\mathcal{L}$ are such that $p \preccurlyeq q$ and $p \wedge q$ exists. Then $p \leq q$.*

Proof. We have $\Delta(p \vee q, p) \leq q$ as $p \preccurlyeq q$. Let $a = p \wedge q$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a &\leq q \\ \Delta(p \vee q, a) &\leq \Delta(p \vee q, p) \leq q \\ \text{Hence} \qquad p \vee q &= a \vee \Delta(p \vee q, a) \\ &\leq q \end{aligned}$$

and so $p \leq q$. □

Corollary 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra, and p, q in $\mathcal{L}$ are such that $p \simeq q$ and $p \wedge q$ exists. Then $p = q$.*

Lemma 1.7. *If $\mathcal{L}$ is a cubic algebra then $\mathcal{L}$ is an MR-algebra iff for all x, y there is some z such that $z \preccurlyeq x$ and $z \preccurlyeq y$.*

Proof. For the left to right implication use $z = x \ \hat{}\ y$. For the other direction if $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ then let $z \preccurlyeq x$ and $z \preccurlyeq y$. Then $x, y \in \mathcal{L}_z$ and so $x \ \hat{}\ y$ exists – as it exists in $\mathcal{L}_x$. □

There are several kinds of embeddings that are of interest in studying cubic algebras. In this paper we will use the notion of full embedding:

Definition 1.8. *Let $f \colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{M}$ be a cubic embedding. Then f is* full *iff for all $m < \mathbf{1}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ there is a $l < \mathbf{1}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ with $m \leq f(l)$.*

1.1. Implication Algebras.

Cubic algebras abound. The simplest construction is using an implication algebra.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an implication algebra. We define

$$\mathscr{I}(\mathcal{I}) = \{ \langle a, b \rangle \mid a, b \in \mathcal{I}, a \vee b = 1 \text{ and } a \wedge b \text{ exists}\}$$

ordered by

$$\langle a, b \rangle \leq \langle c, d \rangle \text{ iff } a \leq c \text{ and } b \leq d.$$

This is a partial order that is an upper semi-lattice with join defined by

$$\langle a, b \rangle \vee \langle c, d \rangle = \langle a \vee c, b \vee d \rangle$$

and a maximum element $\mathbf{1} = \langle 1, 1 \rangle$.

We can also define a Δ function by

$$\text{if } \langle c,d\rangle \leq \langle a,b\rangle \text{ then } \Delta(\langle a,b\rangle, \langle c,d\rangle) = \langle a\wedge(b\to d), b\wedge(a\to c)\rangle\,.$$

There is a natural embedding of $\mathcal{I}$ into $\mathscr{I}(\mathcal{I})$ given by

$$e_{\mathcal{I}}(a) = \langle 1, a\rangle\,.$$

For later reference we note that

$$\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \langle a,b\rangle) = \langle 1\wedge(1\to b), 1\wedge(1\to a)\rangle = \langle b,a\rangle$$

for all $\langle a,b\rangle$.

Generally an isomorphism from one cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$ to another of the form $\mathscr{I}(\mathcal{I})$ for some implication algebra $\mathcal{I}$ is not canonical. For this reason we have the notion of presentation.

Definition 1.9. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra. A* presentation of $\mathcal{L}$ *is an pair $\langle \mathcal{I}, \varphi\rangle$ where $\varphi\colon \mathcal{L}\to\mathscr{I}(\mathcal{I})$ is a cubic isomorphism.*

1.2. **Filters and Filter Algebras.**

1.2.1. *Filter Algebras.* In the special case that $\mathscr{F}$ is an implication lattice there is a canonical Boolean algebra $B_{\mathscr{F}}$ in which $\mathscr{F}$ sits as an ultrafilter – defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{\mathscr{F}} &= \mathscr{F}\times\{0,1\}\\
\langle a,i\rangle\vee\langle b,j\rangle &= \begin{cases}\langle a\vee b,1\rangle & \text{if } i=j=1\\ \langle a\wedge b,0\rangle & \text{if } i=j=0\\ \langle b\to a,1\rangle & \text{if } i=1,\ j=0\\ \langle a\to b,1\rangle & \text{if } i=0,\ j=1\end{cases}\\
\langle a,i\rangle\wedge\langle b,j\rangle &= \begin{cases}\langle a\wedge b,1\rangle & \text{if } i=j=1\\ \langle a\vee b,0\rangle & \text{if } i=j=0\\ \langle a\to b,0\rangle & \text{if } i=1,\ j=0\\ \langle b\to a,0\rangle & \text{if } i=0,\ j=1\end{cases}\\
\overline{\langle a,i\rangle} &= \langle a,1-i\rangle\\
1 &= \langle 1,1\rangle\\
0 &= \langle 1,0\rangle\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The mapping $\iota_{\mathscr{F}}\colon f\mapsto\langle f,1\rangle$ embeds $\mathscr{F}$ as an ultrafilter of $B_{\mathscr{F}}$. This mapping is also an implication embedding and so there is a natural embedding from $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$ into $\mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})$ given by

$$\langle a,b\rangle\mapsto\langle\langle a,1\rangle,\langle b,1\rangle\rangle\,.$$

Note that there is a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{F} \arrow[r, "\iota_{\mathscr{F}}"] \arrow[d, "e_{\mathscr{F}}"'] & B_{\mathscr{F}} \arrow[d, "e_{B_{\mathscr{F}}}"] \\
\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F}) \arrow[r, "\mathscr{I}(\iota_{\mathscr{F}})"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

Definition 1.10. *A cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a* filter algebra *iff $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$ for some implication lattice $\mathscr{F}$.*

1.2.2. *Filters in Cubic Algebras.* Most of the filters we will look at arise in cubic algebras.

On these filters there are several interesting constructions that lead to cubic operations. First intersection.

Lemma 1.11. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra and $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two filters. Then*

$$\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{ f \vee g \mid f \in \mathscr{F} \text{ and } g \in \mathscr{G} \}.$$

Proof. The RHS set is clearly a subset of both $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$.

And if $z \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$ then $z = z \vee z$ is in the RHS set. □

Definition 1.12. *Let $\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G}$ be two $\mathcal{L}$-filters. Then $\mathscr{F} \vee \mathscr{G}$ is defined iff $\mathscr{F} \cup \mathscr{G}$ has fip, in which case it is the filter generated by $\mathscr{F} \cup \mathscr{G}$.*

Lemma 1.13. *If $\mathscr{F} \vee \mathscr{G}$ exists then it is equal to $\{ f \wedge g \mid f \in \mathscr{F} \text{ and } g \in \mathscr{G} \}$.*

Proof. Let S be this set. It is clearly contained in $\mathscr{F} \vee \mathscr{G}$.

If $h \in \mathscr{F} \vee \mathscr{G}$ then there is some $f \in \mathscr{F}$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}$ such that $f \wedge g \leq h$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} h &= h \vee (f \wedge g) \\ &= (h \vee f) \wedge (h \vee g) \\ &\in S. \end{aligned}$$

□

It is easy to show that these operations are commutative, associative, idempotent and satisfy absorption. Distributivity also holds in a weak way.

Lemma 1.14. *Let $\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}, \mathscr{K}$ be subfilters of a filter $\mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$\mathscr{G} \cap (\mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{K}) = (\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{H}) \cap (\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{K}).$$

Proof. Let $x = g \vee (h \wedge k) \in \mathscr{G} \cap (\mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{K})$. Then $x = (g \vee h) \wedge (g \vee k)$ is in $(\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{H}) \cap (\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{K})$.

Conversely if $x = (g_1 \vee h) \wedge (g_2 \vee k)$ is in $(\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{H}) \cap (\mathscr{G} \vee \mathscr{K})$ then $x \geq g_1 \wedge g_2 \in \mathscr{G}$ and $x \geq h \wedge k \in \mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{K}$ so that $x \in \mathscr{G} \cap (\mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{K})$. □

We can also define a relative complement which we defer until section 5.

Filters generate subalgebras of cubic algebras that are always filter algebras. This gives a way a defining when two filters are “similar” – they generate the same subalgebra.

Definition 1.15. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a filter in a cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$. Then*

(a) $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!]$ is the subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}$ generated by $\mathscr{F}$.

(b) $\widehat{\mathscr{F}} = \{ \Delta(x, y) \mid y \leq x,\ x, y \in \mathscr{F} \}$.

Theorem 1.16. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a filter in a cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$. Then*

$$[\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = \widehat{\mathscr{F}}.$$

Proof. See [7] theorem 4.16. □

Definition 1.17. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a filter in a cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is a* generating filter *or a* g-filter *iff $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = \mathcal{L}$.*

Definition 1.18. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two filters in a cubic algebra $\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathscr{F}$* is similar to *$\mathscr{G}$ – written $\mathscr{F} \simeq \mathscr{G}$ – iff $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = [\![\mathscr{G}]\!]$.*

The fact that $\mathscr{F}$ is a g-filter for $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!]$ will often be used in the following. The most important fact about g-filters is that they are naturally isomorphic as implication lattices.

If $\mathscr{F}$ is a g-filter for $\mathcal{L}$ then for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$ there are unique elements $\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \geq \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(x)$ of $\mathscr{F}$ such that $x = \Delta(\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(x), \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(x))$ see [7] lemma 4.23 and theorem 4.29 which also shows that if $\mathscr{G}$ is another generating filter then $\alpha_{\mathscr{F}} \restriction \mathscr{G}$ is an implication homomorphism and $\beta_{\mathscr{F}} \restriction \mathscr{G}$ is an implication isomorphism from $\mathscr{G}$ to $\mathscr{F}$.

Furthermore we have

Theorem 1.19. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a g-filter for $\mathcal{L}$. Then the mapping*

$$x \mapsto \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, x) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(x), x \vee \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(x) \rangle$$

is an isomorphism from $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$.

This mapping will be called the *$\mathscr{F}$-presentation of $\mathcal{L}$.*

Corollary 1.20. *$\mathcal{L}$ is a filter algebra iff $\mathcal{L}$ has a g-filter.*

Using this theorem we can easily define an extension of $\beta_{\mathscr{G}} \colon \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{G}$ to a cubic automorphism $\varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ as the composite

$$\mathcal{L} = [\![\mathscr{F}]\!] \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{I}(\beta_{\mathscr{G}})} \mathscr{I}(\mathscr{G}) \xrightarrow{\sim} [\![\mathscr{G}]\!] = \mathcal{L}$$

Lemma 1.21. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra and $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two filters such that $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = [\![\mathscr{G}]\!]$. Then*

$$\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{ f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f) \mid f \in \mathscr{F} \}.$$

Proof. The RHS set is clearly a subset of both $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$.

And if $z \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$ then $z = \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(z)$ is in the RHS set. □

2. Twisted Filters

Suppose that $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ are two g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$. Then we have an isomorphism from $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$. This representation of $\mathcal{L}$ has a "direction" of decreasing dimension given by the embedding of $\mathscr{F}$ into $\mathscr{I}(\mathscr{F})$. This is perhaps more clearly seen by embedding further into $\mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})$ where the vertices (in some sense) correspond to choosing a basis. It is interesting to see how $\mathscr{G}$ is mapped across.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathscr{I}(B)$ be an interval algebra and $\mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ be a filter. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is* twisted *iff there is no $b \in B$ such that $\mathscr{F} \subseteq [[b, b], \mathbf{1}]$.*

Definition 2.2. *Let B_1, B_2 be two Boolean algebras and $\mathscr{F}$ a filter in $\mathscr{I}(B_1)$. Let $e \colon \mathscr{I}(B_1) \to \mathscr{I}(B_2)$ be a cubic embedding. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is* untwisted along e *iff $e[\mathscr{F}]$ is not twisted.*

Definition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a cubic algebra and $\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ be two filters with $\mathscr{F} \subseteq [\![\mathscr{G}]\!]$. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is* twisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$ *iff $\mathscr{F}$ is twisted under the natural embedding $[\![\mathscr{G}]\!] \simeq \mathscr{I}(\mathscr{G}) \to \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{G}})$.*

The rest of this section provides a characterization of those filters that are untwisted relative to some fixed g-filter $\mathscr{F}$. This is then used to show that this relation is an equivalence relation on the class of g-filters.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$ iff one of $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}) \cap \mathscr{G}$ is principal.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathscr{F}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$. Let $\phi \colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{G}})$ be the natural embedding induced by the $\mathscr{G}$-presentation of $\mathcal{L}$.

First we recall the definition of $\phi - \mathcal{L} \simeq \mathscr{I}(\mathscr{G})$ by

$$x \mapsto \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, x) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(x), x \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(x) \rangle . \tag{1}$$

And $\mathscr{G}$ embeds into $B_{\mathscr{G}}$ by $g \mapsto \langle g, 1\rangle$, so that

$$\phi(x) = \langle\langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, x) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(x), 1\rangle, \langle x \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(x), 1\rangle\rangle \tag{2}$$

Atoms in $\mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{G}})$ are of the form $\langle \overline{a}, a\rangle$ for $a \in B_{\mathscr{G}}$. Thus $\phi[\mathscr{F}]$ is untwisted iff there is some $a \in B_{\mathscr{G}}$ such that

$$\langle \overline{a}, a\rangle \leq \phi(f) \qquad \text{for all } f \in \mathscr{F}. \tag{3}$$

Now such an a is either $\langle g, 1\rangle$ or $\langle g, 0\rangle$ for some $g \in \mathscr{G}$ – so we can rewrite (3) as

$$\langle g, 0\rangle \leq \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \tag{4a}$$

$$\langle g, 1\rangle \leq \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \tag{4b}$$

or

$$\langle g, 1\rangle \leq \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \tag{5a}$$

$$\langle g, 0\rangle \leq \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \tag{5b}$$

We will only look at equations (4) – which are assumed to hold for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$.

First we recall from lemma 1.21 that $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{x \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(x) \mid x \in \mathscr{F}\}$. Thus (4b) implies $g \leq z$ for all $z \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$.

Now (4a) holds iff

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle g, 0\rangle \leq \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \\
\text{iff } &\langle g, 0\rangle \vee \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle = \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \\
\text{iff } &\langle g, 1\rangle \to \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle = \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle \\
\text{iff } &g \to (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f)) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

As this holds for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$ it also holds for $g' = \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(g)$ and in this case we have $g \to (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, g') \vee g) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, g') \vee g$. As $g \leq \Delta(\mathbf{1}, g') \vee g$ this entails $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, g') \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is an MR-algebra we then have $g' \wedge g$ exists. But $g' \simeq g$ so we have $g' = g$.

Hence $[g, \mathbf{1}] = \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G}$.

The version of this argument using equations (5) is much the same, except we have $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, g') = g$ at the end, making $\mathscr{G} \cap \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F})$ principal.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = [g, \mathbf{1}]$ is principal.

Then clearly we have $\langle g, 1\rangle \leq \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle$ for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$.

Also, for any $f \in \mathscr{F}$ the meet $g \wedge f$ exists so that $g \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) = \mathbf{1}$. Hence $g \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f) = 1$ and so $g \to (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f)) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f)$. Thus $\langle g, 0\rangle \leq \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f), 1\rangle$.

Hence $\langle\langle g, 0\rangle, \langle g, 1\rangle\rangle \leq \phi(f)$ for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$.

If $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}) \cap \mathscr{G} = [g, \mathbf{1}]$ is principal then we obtain $\langle\langle g, 1\rangle, \langle g, 0\rangle\rangle \leq \phi(f)$ for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$. □

Corollary 2.5. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$ iff $\mathscr{G}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. This follows directly from the theorem as $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}) \cap \mathscr{G}$ is principal iff $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G}) \cap \mathscr{F}$ is principal. □

Definition 2.6. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be two g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$. Then*

$$\mathscr{F} \sim \mathscr{G} \textit{ iff } \mathscr{F} \textit{ is untwisted relative to } \mathscr{G}.$$

So far we have that $\sim$ is reflexive and symmetric. Now we will show that it is also transitive.

Let $\mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{H}$ be three g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$ and suppose that both $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ are untwisted relative to $\mathscr{H}$.

Lemma 2.7. *Suppose that* $a \le \phi[\mathscr{F}]$ *in* $\mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}})$. *Then the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{F} \arrow[r, "\phi"] \arrow[d, "\beta_{\mathscr{H}}"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) \arrow[d, "f_{a\mathbf{0}}"] \\
\mathscr{H} \arrow[r, "\phi"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

commutes.

Proof. First we check how ϕ acts upon $\mathscr{H}$. We have, for any $h \in \mathscr{H}$

$$h \longmapsto \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, h) \vee h, h \vee h \rangle = \langle \mathbf{1}, h \rangle \mapsto \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle h, 1 \rangle \rangle .$$

We also recall that

$$\begin{array}{rll}
0 \text{ in } B_{\mathscr{H}} & \text{is} & \langle 1, 0 \rangle \\
1 \text{ in } B_{\mathscr{H}} & \text{is} & \langle 1, 1 \rangle \\
\mathbf{0} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) & \text{is} & \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle 1,0 \rangle \rangle \\
\mathbf{1} \text{ in } \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) & \text{is} & \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle 1,1 \rangle \rangle .
\end{array}$$

Now let $f \in \mathscr{F}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(f) &= \langle \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \\
f_{a\mathbf{0}}(\phi(f)) &= (\phi(f) \vee \mathbf{0}) \wedge (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \phi(f)) \vee \mathbf{0}) \\
\phi(f) \vee \mathbf{0} &= \langle \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \vee \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle 1,0 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \vee \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \vee \langle 1,0 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle . \\
\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \phi(f)) \vee \mathbf{0} &= \langle \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle, \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \vee \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle 1,0 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \vee \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \vee \langle 1,0 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{a\mathbf{0}}(\phi(f)) &= (\phi(f) \vee \mathbf{0}) \wedge (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \phi(f)) \vee \mathbf{0}) \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \wedge \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \wedge \langle \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle (f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f)) \wedge (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f)), 1 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \langle \langle 1,1 \rangle, \langle \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1 \rangle \rangle \\
&= \phi(\beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f)).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.8. $\phi[\mathscr{F}]$ *is an ultrafilter in* $[a, \mathbf{1}]$.

Proof. Since we know that $\{\beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f) \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\} = \mathscr{H}$, $\phi[\mathscr{H}]$ is an ultrafilter in $[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}]$ and that $f_{\mathbf{0}a}\colon [\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}] \to [a, \mathbf{1}]$ is a Boolean isomorphism, we know that $\phi[\mathscr{F}] = f_{\mathbf{0}a}[\phi[\beta_{\mathscr{H}}[\mathscr{F}]]] = f_{\mathbf{0}a}[\phi[\mathscr{H}]]$ is also an ultrafilter. □

We have an implication isomorphism $\beta_{\mathscr{F}}\colon \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}$. This extends to a Boolean isomorphism $\psi\colon B_{\mathscr{H}} \to B_{\mathscr{F}}$ by $\langle h, i \rangle \mapsto \langle \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h), i \rangle$.

Lemma 2.9. *The mapping*

$$\mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\phi_{\mathscr{H}}} \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) \xrightarrow{f_{a\mathbf{0}}} \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{I}(\psi)} \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})$$

is equal to $\phi_{\mathscr{F}}\colon \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})$.

Proof. Recall that $\phi_{\mathscr{F}}(f) = \langle\langle 1,1\rangle, \langle f,1\rangle\rangle$ for all $f \in \mathscr{F}$. So we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathscr{F} \arrow[r, "\phi_{\mathscr{H}}"] \arrow[d, "\beta_{\mathscr{H}}"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) \arrow[d, "f_{a\mathbf{0}}"] & \\
\mathscr{H} \arrow[r, "\phi_{\mathscr{H}}"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}}) \arrow[r, "\mathscr{I}(\psi)"'] & \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{F}})
\end{tikzcd}$$

so that any $f \in \mathscr{F}$ is sent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{I}(\psi) \circ f_{a\mathbf{0}} \circ \phi_{\mathscr{H}}(f) &= \mathscr{I}(\psi) \circ \phi_{\mathscr{H}} \circ \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f) \\
&= \mathscr{I}(\psi)(\langle\langle 1,1\rangle, \langle \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1\rangle\rangle) \\
&= \langle\langle 1,1\rangle, \langle \beta_{\mathscr{F}}\beta_{\mathscr{H}}(f), 1\rangle\rangle \\
&= \langle\langle 1,1\rangle, \langle f, 1\rangle\rangle \\
&= \phi_{\mathscr{F}}(f).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\mathscr{F}$,$\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{H}$ be three g-filters for $\mathcal{L}$ and suppose that both $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ are untwisted relative to $\mathscr{H}$. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $b \in \mathscr{I}(B_{\mathscr{H}})$ is such that $b \leq \phi[\mathscr{G}]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{\mathscr{F}}[\mathscr{G}] &= \mathscr{I}(\psi) \circ f_{a\mathbf{0}} \circ \phi_{\mathscr{H}}[\mathscr{G}] \\
&\geq \mathscr{I}(\psi) \circ f_{a\mathbf{0}}(b).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.11. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be untwisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ be untwisted relative to $\mathscr{H}$. Then $\mathscr{F}$ is untwisted relative to $\mathscr{H}$.*

Proof. Since both $\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{H}$ are untwisted relative to $\mathscr{G}$ we can apply the theorem to get the result. □

3. CONNECTING FILTERS

In this section we want to show that filters that are untwisted relative to one another satisfy another rather simple relation definable from Δ. This gives us an easy method of producing all g-filters that are untwisted relative to some fixed g-filter $\mathscr{F}$.

Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a filter in an MR-algebra $\mathcal{L}$ and let $g \in \mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 3.1. *The set*

$$\mathscr{F}_g = \{\Delta(g \vee f, f) \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\}$$

has fip and is upwards closed.

Proof. We just need to check this for intervals. Suppose that $g = [g,h]$, $f_0 = [x,y] \in \mathscr{F}$ and $f_1 = [s,t] \in \mathscr{F}$. Then

$$\Delta(g \vee f_1, f_1) = [(g_0 \wedge x) \vee (g_1 \wedge \overline{y}), (g_0 \vee \overline{x}) \wedge (g_1 \vee y)].$$

Thus

$$\begin{gathered}
\Delta(g \vee f_1, f_1) \wedge \Delta(g \vee f_2, f_2) \text{ exists} \\
\text{iff } (g_0 \wedge x) \vee (g_1 \wedge \overline{y}) \leq (g_0 \vee \overline{s}) \wedge (g_1 \vee t) \\
\text{and } (g_0 \wedge s) \vee (g_1 \wedge \overline{t}) \leq (g_0 \vee \overline{x}) \wedge (g_1 \vee y).
\end{gathered}$$

We will only check the second inequality – the other follows by symmetry.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Clearly } (g_0 \wedge s) \vee (g_1 \wedge \bar{t}) &\leq g_1 \vee y \\ \text{and } g_0 \wedge s &\leq (g_0 \vee \bar{x}) \wedge (g_1 \vee y) && \text{as } g_0 \leq g_1. \\ g_1 \wedge \bar{t} \leq g_0 \vee \bar{x} \text{ as } g_1 \wedge \bar{t} &\leq \bar{t} \leq \bar{x} \leq g_0 \vee \bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

To show upwards closure we note that if $k \geq \Delta(g \vee f, f)$ for some $f \in \mathscr{F}$ then we have $k \in \llbracket \mathscr{F} \rrbracket$ and so there is some $k' \in \mathscr{F}$ with $k \simeq k'$. Then we have $\Delta(g \vee k', k') \simeq k$ and (as above) $\Delta(g \vee k', k') \wedge k \geq \Delta(g \vee k', k') \wedge \Delta(g \vee f, f)$. Hence $k = \Delta(g \vee k', k')$. ☐

Corollary 3.2. *The set*

$$\mathscr{F}_g = \{\Delta(g \vee f, f) \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\}$$

is a filter and $\llbracket \mathscr{F}_g \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathscr{F} \rrbracket$.

Proof. That $\mathscr{F}_g$ is a filter follows from the lemma – since if $f_1, f_2 \in \mathscr{F}$ then we have $\Delta(g \vee (f_1 \wedge f_2), f_1 \wedge f_2) \preccurlyeq f_1 \wedge f_2 \preccurlyeq \Delta(g \vee f_i, f_i)$. As the meet $\Delta(g \vee (f_1 \wedge f_2), f_1 \wedge f_2) \wedge \Delta(g \vee f_i, f_i)$ exists we have $\Delta(g \vee (f_1 \wedge f_2), f_1 \wedge f_2) \leq \Delta(g \vee f_i, f_i)$ and so $\Delta(g \vee (f_1 \wedge f_2), f_1 \wedge f_2) \leq \Delta(g \vee f_1, f_1) \wedge \Delta(g \vee f_2, f_2)$. By upwards closure we then get $\Delta(g \vee f_1, f_1) \wedge \Delta(g \vee f_2, f_2)$ in $\mathscr{F}_g$.

By definition, for each $f \in \mathscr{F}$ there is a $f' \in \mathscr{F}_g$ such that $f \simeq f'$, and conversely. Thus $\llbracket \mathscr{F}_g \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathscr{F} \rrbracket$. ☐

Note that a special case of this is when $g = \mathbf{1}$ and we have $\mathscr{F}_{\mathbf{1}} = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F})$ and that for a principal filter $[h, \mathbf{1}]$ we have $[h, \mathbf{1}]_g = [\Delta(g \vee h, h), \mathbf{1}]$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let* $\mathscr{F}$ *be a filter and* $g \in \mathcal{L}$. *Then* $g \to \mathscr{F} = \{g \to f \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\}$ *is a filter.*

Proof. Recall that $g \to f = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(g \vee f, f)) \vee f$. Hence if $\mathscr{G} = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}_g)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F} &= \{f \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(f) \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\} \\ &= \{\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(g \vee f, f)) \vee f \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\} \\ &= \{g \to f \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\}. \end{aligned}$$

☐

Lemma 3.4.

$$\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{F}_g = [g, \mathbf{1}] \cap \mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. If $f \in \mathscr{F} \cap [g, \mathbf{1}]$ then $g \vee f = f$ and so $\Delta(g \vee f, f) = \Delta(f, f) = f \in \mathscr{F}_g$.

Conversely, if $h \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{F}_g$ then we have $h \wedge \Delta(g \vee h, h)$ exists and so $h = \Delta(g \vee h, h)$. Therefore $g \vee h = h$ and $g \leq h$. ☐

Definition 3.5. *Let* $\mathcal{L}$ *be a cubic algebra,* $\mathscr{F}$ *a filter in* $\mathcal{L}$. *Then* $\mathscr{F}$ *is* weakly principal *iff there is some* g *such that* $\mathscr{F} \subseteq [g, \mathbf{1}]$.

This definition is a lot like $\mathscr{F}$ being untwisted.

Corollary 3.6. *If* $g \in \mathscr{F}$ *then*

$$\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{F}_g = [g, \mathbf{1}].$$

Proof. Obvious ☐

Interestingly enough the converse of this result is also true.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that* $\llbracket \mathscr{G} \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathscr{F} \rrbracket$ *and* $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = [g, \mathbf{1}]$. *Then*

$$\mathscr{G} = \mathscr{F}_g.$$

Proof. Clearly $[g, \mathbf{1}] \subseteq \mathscr{G}$. Suppose that $h \leq g$ and $h \in \mathscr{G}$. Then we have $h' \in \mathscr{F}$ such that $h \simeq h'$. As g, h' are in $\mathscr{F}$ the meet $g \wedge h'$ exists and $h \leq g$ implies $h' \preccurlyeq g$. Hence $h' \leq g$. But then $h' \vee h \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{G} = [g, \mathbf{1}]$ so we have $h \vee h' = g$. Therefore $h = \Delta(h \vee h', h') = \Delta(g \vee h', h') \in \mathscr{F}_g$.

Now for arbitrary $h \in \mathscr{G}$ we have $h \geq h \wedge g \in \mathscr{F}_g$ and so $h \in \mathscr{F}_g$. Thus $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}_g$.

The reverse implication follows as $[\![\mathscr{G}]\!] = [\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = [\![\mathscr{F}_g]\!]$ and so if $h \in \mathscr{F}_g$ there is some $h' \in \mathscr{G}$ with $h \simeq h'$. As $h \wedge h'$ exists we have $h = h' \in \mathscr{G}$. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let* $g, h \in \mathscr{F}$. *Then*
(a) $\mathscr{F} = (\mathscr{F}_g)_g$;
(b) $(\mathscr{F}_g)_h = (\mathscr{F}_g)_{g \vee h}$.

Proof. (a) Since $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{F}_g = [g, \mathbf{1}]$and $[\![\mathscr{F}]\!] = [\![\mathscr{F}_g]\!]$ the lemma implies $\mathscr{F} = (\mathscr{F}_g)_g$.
(b)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}_g \cap (\mathscr{F}_g)_h &= [h, \mathbf{1}] \cap \mathscr{F}_g \\ &= [h, \mathbf{1}] \cap \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{F}_g \\ &= [h, \mathbf{1}] \cap [g, \mathbf{1}] \\ &= [h \vee g, \mathbf{1}].\end{aligned}$$

The lemma now implies $(\mathscr{F}_g)_h = (\mathscr{F}_g)_{g \vee h}$.

□

It is also interesting to determine the shape of $\mathscr{F} \cap \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}_g)$. Corollary 3.3 already shows us that this is $g \to \mathscr{F} = \{g \to f \mid f \in \mathscr{F}\}$. Lemma 3.7 shows us that if this is principal ($= [h, \mathbf{1}]$) then it is contained in $\mathscr{F}_h$.

4. The Group of g-filters

The set of all g-filters of a filter algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a group – where to define the operation we first fix a g-filter $\mathscr{F}$ and let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H} &= \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\mathscr{H}] \\ &= \{\Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h)), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h)) \mid h \in H\}.\end{aligned}$$

This group is a 2-torsion group that has a natural topology – the basic opens are of the form $\mathcal{O}_m = \{\mathscr{H} \mid m \in \mathscr{H}\}$ for each $m \in \mathcal{L}$. We are interested in determining whether $\sim$ is a congruence on this group.

It is clearly so in the case that $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathscr{I}(B)$ for some Boolean algebra – as in that case all g-filters are of the form $[a, \mathbf{1}]$ for some vertex a, and are all equivalent to one another and so there is only one equivalence class.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $\mathscr{H}_1 \cap \mathscr{H}_2 = [h, \mathbf{1}]$. *Then* $(\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_1) \cap (\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_2)$ *is principal.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_1) \cap (\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_2) &= \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\mathscr{H}_1] \cap \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\mathscr{H}_2] \\ &= \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\mathscr{H}_1 \cap \mathscr{H}_2] \\ &= \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[[\mathscr{H}_1 \cap \mathscr{H}_2]h, \mathbf{1}] \\ &= [\varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}(h), \mathbf{1}].\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.2. *Let* $\mathscr{H}_1 \sim \mathscr{H}_2$. *Then* $(\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_1) \sim (\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}_2)$.

Proof. If $\mathscr{H}_1 \cap \mathscr{H}_2$ is principal we are done.

If $\mathscr{H}_1 \cap \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H}_2) = [h, \mathbf{1}]$ then the result follows as above using $\varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H}_2)] = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \varphi_{\langle \mathscr{F}, \mathscr{G} \rangle}[\mathscr{H}_2])$. □

Theorem 4.3. *$\sim$ is a congruence relation.*

Proof. As if $\mathscr{G}_1 \sim \mathscr{G}_2$ and $\mathscr{H}_1 \sim \mathscr{H}_2$ then $\mathscr{G}_1 * \mathscr{H}_1 \sim \mathscr{G}_1 * \mathscr{H}_2 = \mathscr{H}_2 * \mathscr{G}_1 \sim \mathscr{H}_2 * \mathscr{G}_2 = \mathscr{G}_2 * \mathscr{H}_2$. ☐

Lastly we observe that any equivalence class is dense in the group – since if $m \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathscr{G}$ is any g-filter then we have $g = m \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(m) \in \mathscr{G}$ and so $m = \Delta(m \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(m), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(m)) = \Delta(g \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(m), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(m)) \in \mathscr{G}_g$. As $\mathscr{G} \sim \mathscr{G}_g \in \mathcal{O}_m$. Thus we see that the equivalence class of $\mathscr{G}$ hits every basic open.

5. Extending Everything to Filters

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a filter algebra. The construction of $\mathscr{F}_g$ is in some sense a generalization of Δ to the set of g-filters of $\mathcal{L}$. In this section we seek an expansion of this operation to all filters.

We recall that Δ and implication are closely related in cubic algebras. The approach we take here is to define implication first and use it to define Δ. For reasons that may become clear later we will use the reverse order on filters in this section.

5.1. **Relative Complements.**

Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be two $\mathcal{L}$-filters. There are several ways to define the relative complement of $\mathscr{G}$ in $\mathscr{F}$.

Definition 5.1. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be two $\mathcal{L}$-filters. Then*
(a) $\mathscr{G} \supset \mathscr{F} = \bigcap \{\mathscr{H} \mid \mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{G} = \mathscr{F}\}$*;*
(b) $\mathscr{G} \Rightarrow \mathscr{F} = \bigvee \{\mathscr{H} \mid \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ *and* $\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{\mathbf{1}\}\}$*;*
(c) $\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F} = \{h \in \mathscr{F} \mid \forall g \in \mathscr{G}\ h \vee g = \mathbf{1}\}$*.*

We will now show that these all define the same set.

Lemma 5.2. *$\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F} = \mathscr{G} \Rightarrow \mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. Let $h \in (\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}) \cap \mathscr{G}$. Then $\mathbf{1} = h \vee h = h$. Thus $\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \Rightarrow \mathscr{F}$.

Suppose that $\mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{\mathbf{1}\}$. Let $h \in \mathscr{H}$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}$. Then $h \vee g \in \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{G} = \{\mathbf{1}\}$ so that $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. Hence $\mathscr{H} \subseteq (\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F})$ and so $\mathscr{G} \Rightarrow \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$. ☐

Lemma 5.3. *Let $h \in \mathscr{F}$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}$ be such that $g \vee h < \mathbf{1}$. Then $h \notin g \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. This is clear as $h = g \rightarrow f$ implies $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. ☐

Theorem 5.4. *$\mathscr{G} \supset \mathscr{F} = \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $h \notin \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ so that there is some $g \in \mathscr{G}$ with $h \vee g < \mathbf{1}$. Then $h \notin g \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ and clearly $\mathscr{F} = [g, \mathbf{1}] \vee (g \rightarrow \mathscr{F})$ so that $\mathscr{G} \supset \mathscr{F} \subseteq g \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ does not contain h. Thus $\mathscr{G} \supset \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$.

Conversely if $\mathscr{H} \vee \mathscr{G} = \mathscr{F}$ and $k \in \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ then there is some $h \in \mathscr{H}$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}$ with $k = h \wedge g$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} k &= k \vee (h \wedge g) \\ &= (k \vee h) \wedge (k \vee g) \\ &= k \vee h && \text{as } k \vee g = \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

and so $k \geq h$ must be in $\mathscr{H}$. Thus $\mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \supset \mathscr{F}$. ☐

We earlier defined a filter $g \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$. We now show that this new definition of $\rightarrow$ extends this earlier definition.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $g \in \mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$g \rightarrow \mathscr{F} = [g, \mathbf{1}] \rightarrow \mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. Let $g \to f \in g \to \mathscr{F}$ and $k \in [g, \mathbf{1}]$. Then $k \vee (g \to f) \geq g \vee (g \to f) = \mathbf{1}$. Thus $g \to f \in [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F}$ and so $g \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F}$.

Conversely, if $h \in [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F}$ then $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$ and so h is the complement of g in $[h \wedge g, \mathbf{1}]$. Thus $h = g \to (h \wedge g) \in g \to \mathscr{F}$ and so $[g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq g \to \mathscr{F}$. ☐

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. If $h \in \mathscr{H}$ and $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$ then $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$. ☐

Corollary 5.7. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{H}$. Then*

$$\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H} = \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. LHS⊆RHS by the lemma. Conversely if $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ then $h \in \mathscr{H}$ has the defining property for $\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ and so is in $\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$. ☐

Corollary 5.8.

$$\mathscr{G} \to (\mathscr{G} \vee (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})) = \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}.$$

Lemma 5.9. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$\mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. This is clear as $k \vee h = \mathbf{1}$ for all $h \in \mathscr{H}$ implies $k \vee g = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$. ☐

5.2. **Delta on Filters.** Now the critical lemma in defining our new Δ operation.

Lemma 5.10. $(\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \cup \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G})$ *has fip.*

Proof. If $x \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ and $y \in \mathscr{G}$ then $x \vee y = \mathbf{1}$ and so (as $\mathcal{L}$ is an MR-algebra) we know that $x \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, y)$ exists. ☐

Definition 5.11. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \vee \mathscr{G}.$$

The simplest filters in $\mathscr{F}$ are the principal ones. In this case we obtain the following result.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $g \in \mathscr{F}$. Then $\Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{F}_g$.*

Proof. From lemma 5.5 we have $[g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F} = g \to \mathscr{F}$ and we know from corollary 3.3 that $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{F}_g) \cap \mathscr{F} = g \to \mathscr{F}$. Thus $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, g \to \mathscr{F}) \subseteq \mathscr{F}_g$. Also $g \in \mathscr{F}_g$ so we have $\Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F}) \subseteq \mathscr{F}_g$.

Conversely, if $f \in \mathscr{F}$ then $\Delta(g \vee f, f) = (g \vee f) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, g \to f)$ is in $\Delta(1, g \to \mathscr{F}) \vee [g, \mathbf{1}] = \Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F})$. ☐

Corollary 5.13. *Let $g \geq h$ is $\mathscr{F}$. Then*

$$\Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], [h, \mathbf{1}]) = [\Delta(g, h), \mathbf{1}].$$

Proof. As $\Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], [h, \mathbf{1}]) = [h, \mathbf{1}]_g = [\Delta(g, h), \mathbf{1}]$. ☐

For further properties of the Δ operation we need some facts about the interaction between → and Δ. Here is the first.

Lemma 5.14.

$$\mathscr{G} \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}).$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ and $h = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k)$. Then $k \wedge g$ exists so $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, h) \wedge g = k \wedge g$ exists and therefore $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. Hence $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \subseteq \mathscr{G} \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$.

Conversely, suppose that $h \in \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$ and for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$ we have $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. Then there is some $k \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ and $g' \in \mathscr{G}$ such that $h = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k) \wedge g'$. Then $\mathbf{1} = h \vee g' = (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, k) \wedge g') \vee g' = g'$. Thus $h = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k) \in \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})$. ☐

Corollary 5.15.
$$\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})) = \mathscr{G} \vee (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}).$$

Proof.
$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}))\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})) \vee \mathscr{G} \\ &= \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})) \vee \mathscr{G} \\ &= (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \vee \mathscr{G}.\end{aligned}$$

☐

Lemma 5.16. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$. Then*
$$\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) \subseteq \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}).$$

Proof. As $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee \mathscr{G} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \vee \mathscr{G}$. ☐

Lemma 5.17. $\mathscr{F} \cap \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{G}$.

Proof. Clearly $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F} \cap \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$.

Let $g \in \mathscr{G}$ and $k \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ be such that $f = g \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k) \in \mathscr{F}$. Then $k \in \mathscr{F}$ so the meet $k \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k)$ exists. Thus $k = \mathbf{1}$ and so $f = g \in \mathscr{G}$. ☐

5.3. **Boolean elements.** Corollary 5.15 shows us what happens to $\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}))$. We are interested in knowing when this produces $\mathscr{F}$.

Definition 5.18. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be a g-filter. Then*

(a) $\mathscr{G}$ *is* weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean *iff* $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ *and* $(\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} = \mathscr{G}$.
(b) $\mathscr{G}$ *is* weakly Boolean *iff there is some g-filter containing* $\mathscr{G}$ *and* $\mathscr{G}$ *is* $\mathscr{H}$*-Boolean for all such g-filters* $\mathscr{H}$.
(c) $\mathscr{G}$ *is* $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean *iff* $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ *and* $\mathscr{G} \vee (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{F}$.
(d) $\mathscr{G}$ *is* Boolean *iff there is some g-filter containing* $\mathscr{G}$ *and* $\mathscr{G}$ *is* $\mathscr{H}$*-Boolean for all such g-filters* $\mathscr{H}$.

The most interesting of these definitions is the last one. Before continuing however we show that "weak" really is weaker.

Lemma 5.19. *Suppose that $\mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.*

Proof. We know that $\mathscr{G} \subseteq (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}$.

Since $\mathscr{G} \vee (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{F}$ we also have that $(\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \supset \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G}$. ☐

And now the simplest examples of $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters.

Lemma 5.20. *Let $g \in \mathscr{F}$. Then $[g, \mathbf{1}]$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.*

Proof. We know that
$$\Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F}_g) = (\mathscr{F}_g)_g = \mathscr{F}$$
and so
$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F} &= [g, \mathbf{1}] \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F}_g) \\ &= [g, \mathbf{1}] \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F})) \\ &= [g, \mathbf{1}] \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(\mathbf{1}, [g, \mathbf{1}] \to \mathscr{F})) \\ &= [g, \mathbf{1}] \vee (g \to \mathscr{F}).\end{aligned}$$

☐

Essentially because we have so many filter automorphisms we can show that Boolean is not a local concept – that is if $\mathscr{G}$ is Boolean somewhere then it is Boolean everywhere. And similarly for weakly Boolean.

Lemma 5.21. *Let $\mathscr{F}\sim\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ be filters. Let $\beta=\beta_{\mathscr{F}\mathscr{H}}\restriction\mathscr{F}$ (and so $\beta^{-1}=\beta_{\mathscr{H}\mathscr{F}}\restriction\mathscr{H}$). Then $\beta[\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}]=\beta[\mathscr{G}]\to\mathscr{H}$.*

Proof. Indeed if $g\in\mathscr{G}$ and $h\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$ then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}&=\beta(h\vee g)\\&=\beta(h)\vee\beta(g)\end{aligned}$$

and so $\beta(h)\in\beta[\mathscr{G}]\to\mathscr{H}$.

Likewise, if $h\in\beta[\mathscr{G}]\to\mathscr{H}$ and $g\in\mathscr{G}$ then $\mathbf{1}=h\vee\beta(g)=\beta(\beta^{-1}(h)\vee g)$ so that $\beta^{-1}(h)\vee g=\mathbf{1}$. Thus $\beta^{-1}(h)\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$ whence $h=\beta(\beta^{-1}(h))\in\beta[\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}]$. □

Theorem 5.22. *Let $\mathscr{G}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean for some g-filter $\mathscr{F}$. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is Boolean.*

Proof. We have $\mathscr{G}\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})=\mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{H}$. Let $h\in\mathscr{H}$ and find $g\in\mathscr{G}$, $k\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$ with $\beta^{-1}(h)=g\wedge k$. Then $h=\beta(\beta^{-1}(h))=\beta(g\wedge k)=\beta(g)\wedge\beta(k)=g\wedge\beta(k)$ as $g\in\mathscr{H}$ implies $\beta(g)=g$. As $\beta(k)\in\beta[\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}]=\beta[\mathscr{G}]\to\mathscr{H}=\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}$ we have $h\in\mathscr{G}\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H})$. □

Theorem 5.23. *Let $\mathscr{G}$ be weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean for some g-filter $\mathscr{F}$. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is weakly Boolean.*

Proof. Claim 1: $\beta[\mathscr{G}]=\mathscr{G}$ – since $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{H}$ implies $\beta\restriction\mathscr{G}$ is the identity.
Claim 2: Now suppose that $\mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{G}&=\beta[\mathscr{G}]\\&=\beta[(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})\to\mathscr{F}]\\&=\beta[\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}]\to\mathscr{H}\\&=(\beta[\mathscr{G}]\to\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{H}\\&=(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{H}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We need to know certain persistence properties of Boolean-ness.

Lemma 5.24. *Let $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{H}\subseteq\mathscr{F}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{H}$-Boolean and $\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}=(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})\cap\mathscr{H}$.*

Proof. First we note that $\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}=(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})\cap\mathscr{H}$ as $x\in$LHS iff $x\in\mathscr{H}$ and for all $g\in\mathscr{G}$ $x\vee g=\mathbf{1}$ iff $x\in$RHS.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{H}&=\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}\\&=(\mathscr{G}\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}))\cap\mathscr{H}\\&=(\mathscr{G}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee((\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})\cap\mathscr{H})\\&=\mathscr{G}\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}).\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.25. *Let $\mathscr{G}$ be $\mathscr{H}$-Boolean, $\mathscr{H}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then $\mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.*

Proof. Let $f\in\mathscr{F}$. Then there is some $h\in\mathscr{H}$ and $k\in\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{F}$ such that $h\wedge k=f$. Also there is some $g\in\mathscr{G}$ and $l\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}$ such that $h=g\wedge l$. Thus $g\wedge l\wedge k=f$ – so it suffices to show that $l\wedge k\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$.

Clearly $k\wedge l\in\mathscr{F}$. So let $p\in\mathscr{G}$. Then $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{H}$ and $k\in\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{F}$ implies $p\vee k=\mathbf{1}$. $l\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H}$ implies $p\vee l=\mathbf{1}$. Therefore $p\vee(k\wedge l)=(p\vee k)\wedge(p\vee l)=\mathbf{1}\wedge\mathbf{1}=\mathbf{1}$. □

So far we have few examples of Boolean filters. The next lemma produces many more.

Lemma 5.26. *Let $\mathscr{F}\sim\mathscr{H}$. Then $\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean and*

$$(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{F}=\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})\cap\mathscr{F}.$$

Proof. First we show that $(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{F}=\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})\cap\mathscr{F}$.

Let $f\in\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ and $k\in\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})\cap\mathscr{F}$. Then $\Delta(\mathbf{1},k)\in\mathscr{H}$ so $\Delta(\mathbf{1},k)\wedge f$ exists. Therefore $k\vee f=\mathbf{1}$. Hence $\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})\cap\mathscr{F}\subseteq(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{F}$.

Conversely suppose that $k\in(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{F}$. Let $h\in\mathscr{H}$. Then $h\vee k\in\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ and so $h\vee k=(h\vee k)\vee k=\mathbf{1}$. Thus for all $h\in\mathscr{H}$ we have $h\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},k)$ exists. As there is some $k'\simeq k$ in $\mathscr{H}$ this implies $k'=\Delta(\mathbf{1},k)\in\mathscr{H}$ and so $k\in\Delta(\mathbf{1},rsfH)\cap\mathscr{F}$.

Now let $f\in\mathscr{F}$. Then let $f'\in\mathscr{H}$ with $f'\simeq f$. Then $(f\vee f')\to f=f\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},\Delta(f'\vee f,f))=f\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},f')\in\mathscr{F}\cap\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})$. Also $f\vee f'\in\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ and $(f\vee f')\wedge((f\vee f')\to f)=f$ so $f\in(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee(\mathscr{F}\cap\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H}))$. ☐

Corollary 5.27. *Let $\mathscr{F}\sim\mathscr{H}$. Then*

$$\Delta(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})=\mathscr{H}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})&=(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee\Delta(\mathbf{1},(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{F})\\&=(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee\Delta(\mathbf{1},\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{H})\cap\mathscr{F})\\&=(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee(\mathscr{H}\cap\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{F}))\\&=(\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\vee((\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H})\to\mathscr{H})\\&=\mathscr{H}\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathscr{F}\cap\mathscr{H}$ is also $\mathscr{H}$-Boolean. ☐

Lemma 5.28. *Let g,h in $\mathcal{L}$ be such that $g\wedge h$ exists and $g\vee h=\mathbf{1}$. Then $\Delta(g,g\wedge h)=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},h)$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(g,g\wedge h)&=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},g\to(g\wedge h))\\&=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},(g\vee h)\to h)&&\text{by modularity in }[g\wedge h,\mathbf{1}]\\&=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}\to h)\\&=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},h)\end{aligned}$$

☐

Theorem 5.29. *$\mathscr{H}\sim\mathscr{F}$ iff there is an $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filter $\mathscr{G}$ such that $\mathscr{H}=\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})$.*

Proof. The right to left direction is the last corollary.

So we want to prove that $\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})\sim\mathscr{F}$ whenever $\mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.

Let $f\in\mathscr{F}$. We will show that there is some $f'\in\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})$ with $f\simeq f'$. As $\mathscr{G}\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F})=\mathscr{F}$ we can find $g\in\mathscr{G}$ and $h\in\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$ with $f=g\wedge h$. As $g\vee h=\mathbf{1}$ we know that $\Delta(g,g\wedge h)=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},h)$. But $g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},h)\in\mathscr{G}\vee\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{H})=\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})$ and $f=g\wedge h\simeq\Delta(g,g\wedge h)=g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},h)$. ☐

The Boolean elements have nice properties with respect to Δ. We want to show more – that the set of $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean elements is a Boolean subalgebra of $[\mathscr{F},\{\mathbf{1}\}]$ with the reverse order. From this we will later show that the set of all Boolean filters is an atomic MR-algebra.

It suffices to show closure under $\cap$ and $\vee$ – closure under $\to$ follows from lemma 5.19.

Lemma 5.30. *Let $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then $(\mathscr{G}_1\to\mathscr{F})\vee(\mathscr{G}_2\to\mathscr{F})=(\mathscr{G}_1\cap\mathscr{G}_2)\to\mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $h_i \in \mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F}$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$. Then $(h_1 \wedge h_2) \vee g = (h_1 \vee g) \wedge (h_2 \vee g) = \mathbf{1} \wedge \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and so $(h_1 \wedge h_2 \in (\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2) \to \mathscr{F}$.

Conversely, let $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$. As $\mathscr{G}_i$ are both $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean there exists $h_i \in \mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F}$ and $g_i \in \mathscr{G}_i$ with $h = h_1 \wedge g_1 = h_2 \wedge g_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 \wedge h_2 \wedge (g_1 \vee g_2) &= (h_1 \wedge h_2 \wedge g_1) \vee (h_1 \wedge h_2 \wedge g_2) \\ &= (h_2 \wedge h) \vee (h_{1 \wedge h}) \\ &= h \wedge h = h. \end{aligned}$$

As $h_1 \wedge h_2 \in (\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \vee (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})$ and $g_1 \vee g_2 \in \mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$ we then have $h = [h \vee (h_1 \wedge h_2)] \wedge (h \vee g_1 \vee g_2) = h \vee (h_1 \wedge h_2)$ and so $h = h_1 \wedge h_2$ is in $(\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \vee (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})$. ☐

Corollary 5.31. *Let $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then so is $\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathscr{F}$. As $\mathscr{G}_i$ are both $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean there exists $h_i \in \mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F}$ and $g_i \in \mathscr{G}_i$ with $f = h_1 \wedge g_1 = h_2 \wedge g_2$. Then as above $f = h_1 \wedge h_2 \wedge (g_1 \vee g_2)$ and $g_1 \vee g_2 \in \mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$ and $h_1 \wedge h_2 \in (\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \vee (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F}) = (\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2) \to \mathscr{F}$. ☐

Corollary 5.32. *Let $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. Then so is $\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2$.*

Proof. Since we have $(\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} = \mathscr{G}$ for $\mathscr{F}$-Booleans we know that $\mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F}$ are also $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2 &= ((\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}) \vee ((\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}) \\ &= ((\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \cap (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})) \to \mathscr{F} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2) \to \mathscr{F} &= (((\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \cap (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})) \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} \\ &= (\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \cap (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$(\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2) \vee ((\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2) \to \mathscr{F}) = (\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2) \vee ((\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \cap (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})).$$

Let $f \in \mathscr{F}$ and $g_i \in \mathscr{G}_i$, $h_i \in \mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F}$ be such that $f = g_i \wedge h_i$. Then $g_1 \wedge g_2 \in \mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2$, $h_1 \vee h_2 \in (\mathscr{G}_1 \to \mathscr{F}) \cap (\mathscr{G}_2 \to \mathscr{F})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 \wedge g_2 \wedge (h_1 \vee h_2) &= (g_1 \wedge g_2 \wedge h_1) \vee (g_1 \wedge g_2 \wedge h_2) \\ &= (g_2 \wedge f) \vee (g_1 \wedge f) \\ &= f \wedge f && \text{as } f \leq g_i \\ &= f. \end{aligned}$$

☐

Thus we have

Theorem 5.33. *Let $\mathscr{F}$ be any filter. Then $\{\mathscr{G} \mid \mathscr{G}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean$\}$ ordered by reverse inclusion is a Boolean algebra with $\wedge = \vee$, $\vee = \cap$, $1 = \{\mathbf{1}\}$, $0 = \mathscr{F}$ and $\overline{\mathscr{G}} = \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$.*

Proof. This is immediate from lemma 1.14 and preceding remarks, and from lemma 5.19. ☐

We need a stronger closure property for Boolean filters under intersection.

Lemma 5.34. *Let $\mathscr{F} \sim \mathscr{H}$, $\mathscr{G}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean and $\mathscr{K}$ be $\mathscr{H}$-Boolean. Then $\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$ is $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H}$-Boolean.*

Proof. Let $p \in \mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H}$ be arbitrary. Choose $g \in \mathscr{G}$, $g' \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ with $g \wedge g' = p$ and choose $k \in \mathscr{K}$, $k' \in \mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{H}$ with $k \wedge k' = p$.

Then g' and k' are both above p so $g' \wedge k'$ exists and is is $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H}$. Also $(g \vee k) \wedge (g' \wedge k') = p$. $g \vee k \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$ so we need to show that $g' \wedge k'$ is in $(\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}) \to (\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H})$. Let $q \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$. Then $q \vee g' = \mathbf{1} = q \vee k'$ so that $q \vee (g' \wedge k') = (q \vee g') \wedge (q \vee k') = \mathbf{1}$. □

Corollary 5.35. *Let $\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{K}$ be Boolean. Then so is $\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{F} \sim \mathscr{H}$ be two g-filters such that $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ and $\mathscr{K} \subseteq \mathscr{H}$. Then the lemma gives $\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$ to be $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H}$-Boolean. Theorem 5.29 tells us that $\mathscr{F} \cap \mathscr{H}$ is $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. And from lemma 5.25 we have $\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{K}$ to be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. □

The last closure property we need is with respect to Δ.

Lemma 5.36. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. Then*

$$\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}) = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}).$$

Proof. As $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ in a Boolean algebra we have

$$(\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \to (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}.$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H})\\ \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}) &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}).\end{aligned}$$

Let $x \in \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H})$ and $g \in \mathscr{G}$, $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ with $x = g \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, h)$. Let $y \in \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$ and $g' \in \mathscr{G}$, $f \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ with $y = g' \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f)$ and suppose that $x \vee y = \mathbf{1}$ for all such x. Then

$$\begin{aligned}y \vee x &= (g' \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f)) \vee (g \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, h))\\ &= (g' \vee g) \wedge (g' \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, h)) \wedge (\Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \vee g) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f \vee h)\\ &= (g' \vee g) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f \vee h) \qquad \text{since } g \wedge f \text{ and } g' \wedge h \text{ exists.}\end{aligned}$$

Thus $g' \vee g = \mathbf{1}$ and $f \vee h = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$ and all $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$. Choosing $g = g'$ implies $g' = \mathbf{1}$ and so $f \in (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \to (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}$. Hence $y = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) \in \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F})$.

Conversely if $f \in \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}$ then $g \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$. And $f \in (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \to (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})$ implies $h \vee f = \mathbf{1}$ for all $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$. Hence $(g \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, h)) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, f) = \mathbf{1}$ and so $\Delta(\mathbf{1}, f)$ is in $\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$. □

Lemma 5.37. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. Then $\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H})$ is $\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})$-Boolean.*

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) \vee (\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{H}) \to \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F})) &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F})\\ &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \to (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}))\\ &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta((\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee ((\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \to (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})))\\ &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F})\\ &= \Delta(\mathscr{G}, \mathscr{F}).\end{aligned}$$

□

From this lemma we can derive another property of Δ.

Lemma 5.38. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. Then*

$$\mathscr{G} \to \Delta(\mathscr{H}, \mathscr{F}) = (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}).$$

Proof. The RHS is clearly a subset of $\Delta(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})$. Let $g \in \mathscr{G}$. If $h \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$ then $h \vee g = \mathbf{1}$. If $k \in \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F})$ then $g \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, k)$ exists so that $g \vee k = \mathbf{1}$. Thus the RHS is a subset of the LHS.

Conversely suppose that $h = h_1 \wedge h_2$ is in $\mathscr{H} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}) = \Delta(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})$ and $g \vee h = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$. Then $g \vee h_1 = \mathbf{1}$ for all $g \in \mathscr{G}$ and so $h_1 \in \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}$. Thus the LHS is a subset of the RHS. □

Corollary 5.39. *Let $\mathscr{G} \subseteq \mathscr{H} \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ be $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. Then*

$$\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \Delta(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})) = \Delta(\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{H}), \Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(\mathscr{G}, \Delta(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})) &= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \Delta(\mathscr{H},\mathscr{F})) \\
&= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F})) \\
&= \mathscr{G} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{H}) \vee (\mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{F}) \\
&= \Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{H}) \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{H}) \to \Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})) \\
&= \Delta(\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{H}), \Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F})).
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.4. **Weakly Boolean Elements.** The theory of weakly Boolean filters just follows the usual theory of Boolean elements in the Heyting algebra of ideals of a Boolean algebra.

However we also want to consider how the $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters relate to the weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. By lemma 5.19 every $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filter is weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean. There are many other weakly Boolean filters as the next lemma shows:

Lemma 5.40. $((\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} = \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$.

Proof. We know that $\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq ((\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}$. Also $\mathscr{G} \subseteq (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}$ implies $((\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$. □

Thus for any filter $\mathscr{G}$ we see that $\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}$ is weakly Boolean. This gives a natural closure operator $\mathscr{G} \mapsto (\mathscr{G} \to \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} = \mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G})$ from filters to weakly Boolean filters.

To naturally define operations on weakly Boolean filters we have $\mathscr{G}_1 \boldsymbol{\vee} \mathscr{G}_2 = \mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G}_1 \vee \mathscr{G}_2)$.

For meets we use the usual meets as we have:

Lemma 5.41. *Let $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ be two weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters. Then $\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$ is weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.*

Proof. $\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2 \subseteq \mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2)$ is always true.

$\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2 \subseteq \mathscr{G}_i$ and so $\mathscr{G}_i \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq (\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2) \to \mathscr{F}$ and hence $\mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2) \subseteq \mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G}_i) = \mathscr{G}_i$. Hence $\mathrm{cl}(\mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2) \subseteq \mathscr{G}_1 \cap \mathscr{G}_2$. □

5.5. **An MR-algebra.** The above lemmas show us that the set of weakly $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters with operations $\cap$ and $\vee$ forms a Boolean algebra into which the Boolean algebra of $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean filters embeds. The larger algebra is (as usual) complete. These lemmas also show us that there is a natural cubic algebra here.

Theorem 5.42. *Let $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ be the set of all Boolean filters ordered by reverse inclusion. Then*

(a) $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ contains $\{\mathbf{1}\}$ and is closed under the operations $\vee$ and Δ.
(b) $\langle \mathcal{L}_{sB}, \{\mathbf{1}\}, \vee, \Delta \rangle$ is an atomic MR-algebra.
(c) The mapping $e\colon \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}_{sB}$ given by $g \mapsto [g, \mathbf{1}]$ is a full embedding.
(d) The atoms of $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ are exactly the g-filters of $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. (a) It is easy to see that $\mathbf{1}\to\mathscr{F}=\mathscr{F}$ for all filters $\mathscr{F}$. Corollary 5.35 and lemma 5.37 give the closure under join and Delta respectively.

(b) We will proceed sequentially through the axioms.

i. if $x\le y$ then $\Delta(y,x)\vee x=y$ – this is lemma 5.17.

ii. if $x\le y\le z$ then $\Delta(z,\Delta(y,x))=\Delta(\Delta(z,y),\Delta(z,x))$ – this is corollary 5.39.

iii. if $x\le y$ then $\Delta(y,\Delta(y,x))=x$ – this is corollary 5.15 and the definition of $\mathscr{F}$-Boolean.

iv. if $x\le y\le z$ then $\Delta(z,x)\le\Delta(z,y)$ – this is lemma 5.16.
Let $xy=\Delta(1,\Delta(x\vee y,y))\vee y$ for any x, y in $\mathcal{L}$.
First we note that if $\mathscr{G}\subseteq\mathscr{F}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathbf{1},\Delta(\mathscr{G},\mathscr{F}))\cap\mathscr{F}&=\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{G}\vee\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}))\cap\mathscr{F}\\&=(\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{G})\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}))\cap\mathscr{F}.\end{aligned}$$

If $g\in\mathscr{G}$ and $h\in\mathscr{F}$ is such that $\Delta(\mathbf{1},g)\wedge h\in\mathscr{F}$ then $g=\Delta(\mathbf{1},g)$ (since $g\simeq\Delta(\mathbf{1},g)$ and $g\wedge\Delta(\mathbf{1},g)$ exists). Thus $(\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{G})\vee(\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}))\cap\mathscr{F}=\mathscr{G}\to\mathscr{F}$.

v. $(xy)y=x\vee y$ and

vi. $x(yz)=y(xz)$. These last two properties hold as $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ is locally Boolean and hence an implication algebra.

To see that $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ is an MR-algebra it suffices to note that if $\mathscr{G}_1$ and $\mathscr{G}_2$ are in $\mathcal{L}_{sB}$ and we have g-filters $\mathscr{F}_1,\mathscr{F}_2$ with $\mathscr{G}_i\subseteq\mathscr{F}_i$ then $\Delta(\mathscr{F}_1\cap\mathscr{F}_2,\mathscr{F}_2)=\mathscr{F}_1\supseteq\mathscr{G}_1$ so that $\mathscr{F}_2\preccurlyeq\mathscr{G}_1$. It is clear that $\mathscr{F}_2\preccurlyeq\mathscr{G}_2$.

(c) It is clear that this mapping preserves order and join. Preservation of Δ is corollary 5.13.

It is full because $[g,\mathbf{1}]\subseteq\mathscr{G}$ whenever $g\in\mathscr{G}$.

(d) This is theorem 5.29.

□

6. The Algebra of g-filters

Earlier we looked at the group of g-filters with an operation that comes from the β functions. In all atomic MR-algebras there is a natural isomorphism between $[v,\mathbf{1}]$ and the set of atoms (or vertices) given by $x\mapsto\Delta(x,v)$ with inverse $w\mapsto w\vee v$.

Thus the theorem above gives us another way to make the set of g-filters into an algebra – by defining

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\mathscr{F}\\1&=\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{F})\\\mathscr{H}+\mathscr{G}&=\Delta((\mathscr{H}\cap\mathscr{F})+(\mathscr{G}\cap\mathscr{F}),\mathscr{F})\\\mathscr{H}\cdot\mathscr{G}&=\Delta((\mathscr{H}\cap\mathscr{F})\vee(\mathscr{G}\cap\mathscr{F}),\mathscr{F})\end{aligned}$$

This makes an algebra isomorphic to $[\mathscr{F},\mathbf{1}]$.

We want to show that this is an extension of the group the operations $+$ and $*$ are the same.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{H}$ be two g-filters. Then*

$$\mathscr{G}*\mathscr{H}=\mathscr{G}+\mathscr{H}.$$

Proof. We know that $\Delta((\mathscr{H}\cap\mathscr{F})+(\mathscr{G}\cap\mathscr{F}),\mathscr{F})=\Delta(\mathbf{1},\mathscr{K}\to\mathscr{F})\vee\mathscr{K}$ where $\mathscr{K}$ is the filter $(\mathscr{H}\cap\mathscr{F})+(\mathscr{G}\cap\mathscr{F})$.

Also

$$\mathscr{G}*\mathscr{H}=\left\{\Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h)),\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h))\mid h\in\mathscr{H}\right\}.$$

As both sides are g-filters, it suffices to show that

$$\mathscr{K} \subseteq \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H} \tag{6}$$

$$\mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}). \tag{7}$$

First we elaborate on $\mathscr{K}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{K} &= (\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) + (\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}) \\ &= \Big[[(\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}] \vee (\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F})\Big] \cap \\ &\qquad \Big[[(\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}] \vee (\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F})\Big]\end{aligned}$$

$$[(\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}] \vee (\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) = \{g \in \mathscr{F} \mid g = g_1 \wedge g_2,\ g_2 \in \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F} \text{ and } \forall k \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}\ g_1 \vee k = \mathbf{1}\}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} g \in \mathscr{K} \leftrightarrow g &= g_1 \wedge g_2,\ g_2 \in \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F} \text{ and } \forall k \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}\ g_1 \vee k = \mathbf{1} \\ \text{and} \qquad g &= h_1 \wedge h_2,\ h_2 \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F} \text{ and } \forall k \in \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}\ h_1 \vee k = \mathbf{1}.\end{aligned}$$

(1): Let $k \in \mathscr{K}$. We want to show that $k \in \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} k \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k) &= (h_1 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k)) \wedge (h_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k)) \\ &= h_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k). \\ k \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k) &= (g_1 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)) \wedge (g_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)) \\ &= g_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k). \end{aligned}$$

Also $h_2 \in \mathscr{G}$, $h_2 \geq k$ so that $\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k) \preccurlyeq h_2$ and $\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k) \wedge h_2$ exists. Thus $\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k) \leq h_2$. Likewise $\beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k) \leq g_2$.

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} k &= (h_1 \wedge h_2) \vee (g_1 \wedge g_2) \\ &= (h_1 \vee g_1) \wedge (h_2 \wedge g_2) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathscr{H}}(k) = k \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k) &= (h_1 \vee g_1 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k)) \wedge (h_2 \wedge g_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k)) \\ &= h_2 \vee g_2 \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k) \\ &= h_2 \vee g_2. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise we have

$$\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(k) = k \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k) = h_2 \vee g_2.$$

Thus $\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(k) = \alpha_{\mathscr{H}}(k)$. Let $h = \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k)$. Then $\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h) = \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)$ and $\alpha_{\mathscr{H}}(k) = k \vee \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(k) = \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h) \vee h = \alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h)$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h)) &= \Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}\alpha_{\mathscr{H}}(k), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)) \\ &= \Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(k), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)) \\ &= \Delta(\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(k), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(k)) \\ &= k. \end{aligned}$$

2: (a) Now we show that $\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F} \subseteq \mathscr{K}$. The reverse inclusion follows from the last part.

Let

$$r = \begin{cases} \Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{G}}\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h), \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h)) & \text{for some } h \in \mathscr{H} \\ \Delta(\beta_{\mathscr{H}}\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(g), \beta_{\mathscr{H}}(g)) & \text{for some } g \in \mathscr{G} \end{cases}$$

be in $\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}$. We recall that for any g-filter $\mathscr{Q}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\mathbf{1}, x) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{Q}}(x) &= \alpha_{\mathscr{Q}}(x) \to \beta_{\mathscr{Q}}(x) \\ x \vee \beta_{\mathscr{Q}}(x) &= \alpha_{\mathscr{Q}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

From this and the above equations we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r) &= \Delta(\mathbf{1}, r) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \\ r \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r) &= \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \\ \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r)) &= r \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r)) \\ r &= \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \wedge \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r)) \end{aligned}$$

These are both in $\mathscr{F}$ as they are both greater than r. Clearly $\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \in \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}$. We want to show that $p = \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r))$ is in $(\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F}$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) &= \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h)) \\ \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r) &= \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h) \\ \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(p) &= \alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r). \end{aligned}$$

Now pick any $h' \in \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(p \vee h') &= \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(p) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h') && \text{from } \beta_{\mathscr{G}} \colon \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{G} \\ &= (\alpha_{\mathscr{G}}(r) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(r)) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h') \\ &= (\beta_{\mathscr{G}}(\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h)) \to \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h)) \vee \beta_{\mathscr{G}}(h') \\ &= \beta_{\mathscr{G}}((\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h) \to h) \vee h') && \text{from } \beta_{\mathscr{G}} \colon \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{G} \\ \alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h) \to h &= (h \vee \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h)) \to h \\ &= \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \Delta(h \vee \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h), h)) \vee h \\ &= \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h)) \vee h \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_{\mathscr{F}}(h) \to h) \vee h' &= h \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h)) \vee h' \\ &= \mathbf{1} && \text{since } h' \in \mathscr{F} \text{ and} \\ & && \text{so the meet } \beta_{\mathscr{F}}(h) \wedge h' \text{ exists.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$p \vee h' = \mathbf{1}.$$

It follows that $r \in (\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}) \vee ((\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F})$. Dually we have $r \in (\mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) \vee ((\mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F})$ and so $r \in \mathscr{K}$.

(b) $\mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{F} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H})$. We appeal to lemma 5.26. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{F} &= (\mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H} \cap \mathscr{F}) \to \mathscr{F} \\ &= \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}) \cap \mathscr{F} \\ &\subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}). \end{aligned}$$

(c) Thus we have $\Delta(\mathscr{K}, \mathscr{F}) = \mathscr{K} \vee \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{K} \to \mathscr{F}) \subseteq \mathscr{G} * \mathscr{H}$. Since both sides are g-filters they must be equal. This can also be seen from corollary 5.27.

□

Earlier we showed that the relation $\mathscr{G} \sim \mathscr{H}$ is a congruence on the group of g-filters. We can then look at the subgroup $\mathscr{N} = \{\mathscr{K} \mid \mathscr{K} \sim \mathscr{F}\}$. From the isomorphism with $[\mathscr{F}, \mathbf{1}]$, the theorem above and from theorem 2.4 and corollary 3.6, lemma 3.7 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{G} \sim \mathscr{F} &\iff \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F} \text{ or } \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G}) \cap \mathscr{F} \text{ is principal}\\ &\iff \exists g \in \mathscr{F}\ \mathscr{G} \cap \mathscr{F} = [g, \mathbf{1}] \text{ or } \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G}) \cap \mathscr{F} = [g, \mathbf{1}]\\ &\iff \exists g \in \mathscr{F}\ \mathscr{G} = \Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F}) \text{ or } \Delta(\mathbf{1}, \mathscr{G}) = \Delta([g, \mathbf{1}], \mathscr{F}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that the corresponding subalgebra of $[\mathscr{F}, \mathbf{1}]$ is $\{[g, \mathbf{1}] \mid g \in \mathscr{F}\} \cup \{g \to \mathscr{F} \mid g \in \mathscr{F}\}$.

This is a subalgebra, but is not upwards or downward closed and so does not induce a Boolean congruence on $[\mathscr{F}, \mathbf{1}]$.

Thus we have shown that the algebra of filters of a filter MR-algebra has properties very like those of the algebra of filters of a Boolean algebra. We are able to recover a Boolean component of that poset that gives a natural MR-algebra into which our original structure embeds as an upwards-dense subalgebra. We expect that many of these ideas can be extended to larger families of cubic algebras, particularly those that are generated by implication algebras.

However we also know that there are MR-algebras that cannot be represented as filter algebras and for these some new idea is clearly needed.

REFERENCES

[1] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *Automorphisms of Cubic Algebras I*, in preparation.
[2] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *Automorphisms of Cubic Algebras II*, in preparation.
[3] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *An Axiomatization for Cubic Algebras*, in 'Mathematical Essays in Honor of Gian-Carlo Rota' ed. B.E.Sagan & R.P.Stanley, Birkhaüser 1998.
[4] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *Another view of Cubic Algebras*, in preparation.
[5] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *The theory of Cubic Lattices*, in preparation.
[6] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *Congruences and Homomorphisms of Cubic Algebras*, in preparation.
[7] C.G.Bailey and J.S.Oliveira, *Cube-like structures generated by filters*, in preparation.
[8] R.Balbes & P.Dwinger *Distributive Lattices*, University of Missouri Press, 1974.
[9] M.K.Bennett, *The face lattice of an n-dimensional cube*, Alg.Univ. 14 (1982) 82-86.
[10] G.Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory* 3rd edition, AMS., Providence R.I.
[11] G.Birkhoff, *Some Applications of Universal Algebra*, Coll.Math.Soc.János Bolyai 29 (1977) 107-128.
[12] W. Y. C. Chen and J. S. Oliveira, *Implication Algebras and the Metropolis-Rota Axioms for Cubic Lattices*, J.Algebra 171 (1993) 383-396
[13] G.Grätzer, *General Lattice Theory*, Academic Press 1978
[14] N.Metropolis and G.-C.Rota, *Combinatorial Structure of the faces of the n-Cube*, SIAM J.Appl.Math. 35 (1978)689-694.
[15] J. S. Oliveira, *The Theory of Cubic Lattices*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 1992.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RESEARCH, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND
E-mail address: `Colin.Bailey@vuw.ac.nz`

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORIES, RICHLAND, WASHINGTON, U.S.A.
E-mail address: `Joseph.Oliveira@pnl.gov`